

INFORMATION CAPACITY OF BIOLOGICAL MACROMOLECULAE RELOADED

Michael G.Sadovsky

*Institute of biophysics of SD of RAS;
660036 Russia, Krasnoyarsk, Akademgorodok.**

Information capacity of a symbol sequence is a measure of the unexpectedness of a continuation of given string of symbols. Continuation of a string is determined through the maximum entropy of the reconstructed frequency dictionary; the capacity, in turn, is determined through the calculation of mutual entropy of a real frequency dictionary of a sequence with respect to the reconstructed one. The capacity does not depend on the length of strings in a dictionary. The capacity calculated for various genomes exhibits a multi-minima pattern reflecting an order observed within a sequence.

PACS numbers: 87.10.+e, 87.14.Gg, 87.15.Cc, 02.50.-r

I. INTRODUCTION

The analysis of statistical patterns in completely sequenced genomes is of great interest. The correlations observed within these latter reflect some biological features of primary structures [1, 2, 3, 4]. In particular, the sequence periodicity of 3 base pairs (bp) indicates the presence of protein coding regions in a genome; more exactly, non-coding regions are invariant against the frame shift of the codon pattern, while the coding ones lack these invariance [5, 6, 7].

A complexity of patterns observed in a genetic sequence may vary significantly. The complexity itself is a matter of interests of mathematicians, biologists and biophysicists [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Screening a genome with respect to a complexity of different fragments of that latter, a student may find various biologically important peculiarities in a nucleotide sequence. Information capacity measurements bring, in turn, a new knowledge towards the genetic entities. Here we present a new approach to determine the information capacity of a symbol sequence, with applications to genetic sequences.

To begin with, it should be stressed, that a symbol sequence has zero information content, zero information capacity, and zero redundancy, being a finite object. To discuss all these issues with particular respect to the genetic entities, one must change a finite sequence for a frequency dictionary of short strings. Such transformation makes a student change a consideration of a finite sequence for the ensemble of (infinite) sequences, which yield the same distribution of frequency of short strings, as a given dictionary determined over a finite sequence; further, we shall no more mention this difference, provided that no misunderstanding occurs. If any, special remarks would be done.

Physically, DNA sequence is a polymer molecule, which could be considered as a symbol sequence from the four-letter alphabet $\aleph = \{A, C, G, T\}$, where A refers

to adenine, C refers to cytosine, G refers to guanine, and T refers to thymine. Let N be the length of the sequence, i.e. the number of symbols in it. Further, we shall consider the continuous sequences only; a consideration of unbound sequences is possible, while brings no new comprehension, but the technical problems [16, 17].

Any continuous string of the length q , $1 \leq q \leq N$ observed within a sequence makes a **word** $\omega = \nu_1 \nu_2 \nu_3 \dots \nu_{q-1} \nu_q$ (of the length q); here $\nu_j \in \{A, C, G, T\}$. A set of all the words (of the given length q) observed at the sequence makes the **support** of that former (or q -support, if indication of the length is necessary). Providing each element of a support (i.e., each word ω) with the number n_ω of copies of that latter, one gets the dictionary $\mathfrak{F}_q$ of the sequence (of the thickness q). The dictionary $\mathfrak{F}_q$ is a finite object, as well. Changing the number of copies n_ω for frequency:

$$f_\omega = \frac{n_\omega}{N},$$

one gets a **frequency dictionary** W_q (of the thickness q).

Such definition of frequency requires a connection of a sequence into a ring; the motivation behind such transformation is simple and obvious. Any dictionary of the thickness q could easily be transformed into a thinner dictionary $q-1$. To get the dictionary W_{q-1} , one must sum up the frequency of words differing in the first, or in the last symbol. Being provided over a dictionary $\mathfrak{F}_q$, these two summations would yield two different results; the difference results from a finite sampling. The starting $q-1$ symbols will not be accounted, if the summation would be carried over the first symbol; reciprocally, the ending $q-1$ symbols will be lost, if the summation would be carried out over the last symbol. A connection of a sequence into a ring eliminates the problem.

Consider a symbol sequence. Compose, then, a chain of dictionaries W_j of increasing thickness j :

$$W_1 \leftrightarrow W_2 \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow W_q \leftrightarrow W_{q+1} \leftrightarrow \dots \leftrightarrow W_N \leftrightarrow \dots \quad (1)$$

Study of statistical properties of symbol sequences means an investigation of the relations between the dictionaries

*Electronic address: msad@icm.krasn.ru

within the chain. A downward transformation, i.e., the transition from W_j to W_{j-1} is simple and unique. On the contrary, the upward transformation is ambiguous, in general. A word ω may have several continuations (not more than 4, in case of nucleotide sequences). Such ambiguity results in a positive information capacity of the relevant frequency dictionary.

II. RECONSTRUCTED FREQUENCY DICTIONARY

An ambiguity of transformation of a thinner dictionary into a thicker one rises a question towards the reconstruction of the dictionary. Indeed, while the downward transformation $W_j \rightarrow W_{j-1}$ is unique, the upward transformation, in general, generates several dictionaries. A transformation of W_j into W_{j+1} consists in a combination of words from the frequency dictionary W_j so, that the dictionary bearing the combined longer words yields the original frequency dictionary. In other words, each combined set $f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q\nu_{q+1}}^*$ of longer words must meet the constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\nu_{q+1}} f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q\nu_{q+1}}^* &= \\ &= \sum_{\nu_{q+1}} f_{\nu_{q+1}\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q}^* = \\ &= f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q}, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q}$ is the frequency of a word $\omega = \nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q$ from the given frequency dictionary. Linear constraints (2) eliminate a part of possible combi-

nations of words, but an abundance of the combinations is still great enough.

Since a set of dictionaries $\{W_{q+1}^{(1)}, W_{q+1}^{(2)}, W_{q+1}^{(3)}, \dots, W_{q+1}^{(k)}\}$ still meet the constraint (2), one has to figure out a single one that is expected to be the reconstructed entity. Such reconstructed dictionary is identified through the maximum entropy

$$\max_j \left\{ - \sum_{\omega^*} f_{\omega^*}^{(j)} \cdot \ln f_{\omega^*}^{(j)} \right\} \quad (3)$$

of a dictionary, where $\omega^* = \nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q\nu_{q+1}$ is a word meeting the linear constraint (2). The dictionary $\widetilde{W}_{q+1}$ meeting the maximal principle (3) exists always, since the set of the dictionaries which could be combined from the given one is finite.

The frequency of words $\tilde{\omega} \in \widetilde{W}_{q+1}$ could be figured out explicitly, by LaGrange multiplier method [18, 19, 20, 21]. Frequency of a word ω of the reconstructed dictionary $\tilde{\omega}$ is determined by the expression

$$\tilde{f}_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q\nu_{q+1}} = \frac{f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q} \times f_{\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q\nu_{q+1}}}{f_{\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q}}. \quad (4)$$

The expression (4) coincides perfectly to the Kirkwood's approximation [22]; an absence of the interaction via the third "particle" makes the expression (4) here an exact solution of the problem.

Actually, the maximal entropy principle (3) allows to reconstruct the dictionary $\widetilde{W}_{q+l}$ for any $l > 1$. Here we provide a final formula

$$\tilde{f}_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q+l-1}\nu_{q+l}} = \frac{f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q} \times f_{\nu_2\nu_3\nu_4\dots\nu_q\nu_{q+1}} \times \dots \times f_{\nu_{l+1}\nu_{l+2}\dots\nu_{q+l-2}\nu_{q+l-1}} \times f_{\nu_{l+1}\nu_{l+2}\nu_{l+3}\dots\nu_{q+l-1}\nu_{q+l}}}{f_{\nu_2\nu_3\nu_4\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q} \times f_{\nu_3\nu_4\nu_5\dots\nu_q\nu_{q+1}} \times \dots \times f_{\nu_{l+2}\nu_{l+3}\nu_{l+4}\dots\nu_{q+l-2}\nu_{q+l-1}}}; \quad (5)$$

see [18, 19, 20] for details.

Reconstruction of a thicker dictionary (4) due to the maximum entropy principle yields the dictionary $\widetilde{W}_{q+1}$ (or $\widetilde{W}_{q+l}$, respectively), that bears no outer, additional information. It contains the words of the length $q+1$ (of the length $q+l$, respectively) that are the most probable continuations of the words of the length q . The reconstructed dictionary $\widetilde{W}_{q+1}$ bears all the words that occur at the dictionary W_{q+1} and, maybe, some other ones. For any $q, q \geq 1$

$$S[\widetilde{W}_{q+1}] \geq S[W_{q+1}].$$

Quite often, the expression (4) is considered to be an evidence of the Markovian property of an original se-

quence [23], while that is not true. The expression (4) is derived with no respect to a structure of the sequence. Indeed, this expression coincides to the formula for the Markov process of q -th order. The coincidence is not odd; it means, that Markov model of a sequences realizes the hypothesis of the most probable continuation of a string. We shall discuss this issue further (see section IV A).

III. INFORMATION CAPACITY

Information capacity is a measure of deviation of the reconstructed dictionary (10) from the real one. The deviation could be measure in various ways. The approach based on so called "quality of reconstruction" of dictio-

TABLE I: Information capacity (10) determined for three chromosomes of *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* complete genome and for eleven chromosomes of *Encephalitozoon cuniculi*. q is the dictionary thickness.

<i>S.pombe</i>				<i>E.cuniculi</i>										
q	chr.I	chr.II	chr.III	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII	VIII	IX	X	XI
2	0.00757	0.00743	0.00793	0.02042	0.01953	0.01846	0.02016	0.01968	0.02100	0.02102	0.02057	0.01990	0.02045	0.01953
3	0.00202	0.00200	0.00211	0.01022	0.01027	0.01018	0.00945	0.01067	0.01088	0.00992	0.00982	0.00974	0.01023	0.00989
4	0.00204	0.00205	0.00217	0.00565	0.00484	0.00466	0.00448	0.00417	0.00472	0.00469	0.00472	0.00429	0.00445	0.00469
5	0.00079	0.00080	0.00102	0.00503	0.00385	0.00425	0.00401	0.00398	0.00406	0.00393	0.00377	0.00349	0.00386	0.00407
6	0.00092	0.00108	0.00121	0.00950	0.00874	0.00831	0.00772	0.00843	0.00807	0.00745	0.00771	0.00669	0.00699	0.00694
7	0.00231	0.00219	0.00201	0.02737	0.02726	0.02826	0.02455	0.02626	0.02523	0.02466	0.02305	0.02229	0.02114	0.02128
8	0.00428	0.00387	0.00346	0.10920	0.10910	0.11163	0.09981	0.10269	0.10014	0.09642	0.09141	0.08825	0.08316	0.08238
9	0.00955	0.00758	0.00699	0.31844	0.32478	0.33002	0.30823	0.30911	0.30287	0.29743	0.29264	0.28492	0.27174	0.27101
10	0.03413	0.02986	0.07854	0.43406	0.43628	0.43629	0.44194	0.43809	0.43332	0.43741	0.43859	0.44005	0.43754	0.43805
11	0.18561	0.14578	0.37254	0.27997	0.28007	0.27795	0.29237	0.28930	0.29570	0.29900	0.30620	0.31277	0.32115	0.32204
12	0.41966	0.38547	0.39866	0.11074	0.10991	0.10736	0.11744	0.11686	0.12058	0.12409	0.12828	0.13220	0.13832	0.13953
13	0.47562	0.41855	0.32564	0.03657	0.03448	0.03309	0.03791	0.03857	0.04054	0.04062	0.04082	0.04183	0.04613	0.04571
14	0.42864	0.39654	0.12658	0.01142	0.01000	0.00975	0.01142	0.01118	0.01200	0.01236	0.01204	0.01244	0.01384	0.01350
15	0.17547	0.15487	0.06246	0.00380	0.00313	0.00269	0.00338	0.00300	0.00376	0.00364	0.00356	0.00344	0.00404	0.00383
16	0.09254	0.08754	0.02457	0.00122	0.00109	0.00090	0.00108	0.00101	0.00097	0.00091	0.00122	0.00109	0.00112	0.00126
17	0.04369	0.03965	0.01288	0.00045	0.00030	0.00019	0.00032	0.00029	0.00037	0.00035	0.00027	0.00036	0.00043	0.00042
18	0.01485	0.00987	0.00712	0.00023	0.00008	0.00011	0.00008	0.00010	0.00020	0.00012	0.00014	0.00012	0.00013	0.00014
19	0.00204	0.00175	0.00121	0.00015	0.00010	0.00005	0.00008	0.00004	0.00005	0.00005	0.00006	0.00003	0.00003	0.00007
20	0.00021	0.00018	0.00013	0.00020	0.00005	0.00004	0.00005	0.00001	0.00001	0.00001	0.00005	0.00001	0.00004	0.00002

nary is discussed in [18, 19, 20]. A student may implement a regular Euclidean distance to determine the difference between $\widetilde{W}_{q+1}$ and W_{q+1} . Here we explore more sensitive and more efficient method to detect the difference between the entities, based on the calculation of mutual entropy.

Mutual entropy of a distribution ϕ with respect to a distribution ψ^* is defined as

$$\overline{S}[\psi^*|\phi] = \sum_{\mu} \phi \cdot \ln \left(\frac{\phi}{\psi^*} \right), \quad (6)$$

where μ is the space of definition of distributions ϕ and ψ^* [24, 25]. Here the distribution ψ^* is the equilibrium one. We shall define the information capacity in similar way: real frequency W_q should be considered to be a distribution, while the reconstructed dictionary $\widetilde{W}_q$ should be considered the “equilibrium” one. Such definition holds true, since the q -support of the reconstructed dictionary always contains the q -support of the real one.

To determine an information capacity of a frequency dictionary W_q , one needs to develop the relevant reconstructed dictionary $\widetilde{W}_q$ (of the same thickness q). Formula (4) is changed for

$$\widetilde{f}_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q} = \frac{f_{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-2}\nu_{q-1}} \times f_{\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q}}{f_{\nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-2}\nu_{q-2}}}, \quad (7a)$$

$$\widetilde{f}_{\nu_1\nu_2} = f_{\nu_1} \times f_{\nu_2}, \quad (7b)$$

with (7b) for the case of $q = 2$. The formulae for the reconstruction of a dictionary of the thickness q over a

dictionary of the thickness s , $s < q - 1$ could be provided, as well; further we shall keep within the case of the reconstruction of $\widetilde{W}_q$ over W_{q-1} . The expression (6) looks like

$$\overline{S}[\widetilde{W}_q|W_q] = \sum_{\omega} f_{\omega} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{f_{\omega}}{f_{\omega}} \right) \quad (8)$$

for the case of frequency dictionaries. Substituting (7) into (8), one gets

$$\overline{S}[\widetilde{W}_q|W_q] = \sum_{\omega} f_{\omega} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{f_{\omega} \times f_{\omega''}}{f_{\omega_L} \times f_{\omega_R}} \right) \quad (9a)$$

or

$$\overline{S}[\widetilde{W}_2|W_2] = \sum_{\nu_1\nu_2} f_{\nu_1\nu_2} \cdot \ln \left(\frac{f_{\nu_1\nu_2}}{f_{\nu_1} \times f_{\nu_2}} \right), \quad (9b)$$

here $\omega_L = \nu_1\nu_2\dots\nu_{q-2}\nu_{q-1}$, $\omega_R = \nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-1}\nu_q$ and $\omega'' = \omega_L \cap \omega_R = \nu_2\nu_3\dots\nu_{q-2}\nu_{q-1}$. Expanding the ratio in (9) into a sum of four terms and summing up over the “extra” indices, one gets

$$\overline{S}_q = 2S_{q-1} - S_q - S_{q-2} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{S}_2 = 2S_1 - S_2. \quad (10)$$

The formulae (10) are changed for

$$\overline{S}_q = (q-s+1)S_s - S_q - (q-s)S_{s-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \overline{S}_q = qS_1 - S_q$$

for the case of (5).

A. Some properties of information capacity

The information capacity defined according to (10) exhibits some peculiarities making the capacity a powerful tool for a study of symbol sequences. Let's consider

TABLE II: Information capacity (10) of nineteen complete genomes of archea bacteria. N is the length of a genome.

Entry	Species	N	Frequency thickness							
			$q = 2$	$q = 3$	$q = 4$	$q = 5$	$q = 6$	$q = 7$	$q = 8$	$q = 9$
BA000002	<i>A. pernix</i> K1	1669695	0.015290	0.007944	0.012311	0.006464	0.005223	0.008679	0.015346	0.053446
AE000782	<i>A. fulgidus</i> DSM 4304	2178400	0.018170	0.007606	0.011233	0.008505	0.006617	0.008051	0.013013	0.041986
AE004437	<i>Halobacterium</i> sp.	2014239	0.028372	0.007114	0.013193	0.008810	0.013955	0.013883	0.016140	0.044798
AE000666	<i>M. thermoautotrophicum</i> δ H	1751377	0.021919	0.012330	0.009047	0.006213	0.007599	0.009382	0.016337	0.052717
L77117	<i>M. jannaschii</i> DSM 2661	1664970	0.020938	0.007459	0.013321	0.004747	0.006425	0.009844	0.016392	0.046324
BX950229	<i>M. maripaludis</i>	1661137	0.015925	0.006152	0.006783	0.005068	0.005482	0.008590	0.017090	0.054143
AE009439	<i>M. kandleri</i> AV19	1694969	0.016257	0.008819	0.006385	0.003698	0.003846	0.007801	0.014203	0.052200
AE010299	<i>M. acetivorans</i>	5751492	0.014008	0.010528	0.003869	0.001678	0.001791	0.004272	0.005894	0.019365
AE008384	<i>M. mazei</i>	4096345	0.015407	0.013163	0.004834	0.001999	0.002125	0.004579	0.006651	0.022871
AE017199	<i>N. equitans</i>	490885	0.018216	0.012787	0.008837	0.004529	0.007170	0.016564	0.044161	0.122603
AE017261	<i>P. torridus</i> DSM 9790	1545895	0.015631	0.014016	0.010894	0.008151	0.006663	0.008954	0.017796	0.056461
AE009441	<i>P. aerophilum</i>	2222430	0.007622	0.014392	0.010685	0.010080	0.004820	0.006798	0.012019	0.040344
AL096836	<i>P. abyssi</i>	1765118	0.015921	0.008895	0.005493	0.005236	0.004513	0.006985	0.014085	0.049796
AE009950	<i>P. furiosus</i> DSM 3638	1908256	0.021224	0.005685	0.003697	0.003117	0.003536	0.006347	0.013273	0.046818
BA000001	<i>P. horikoshii</i>	1738505	0.019283	0.007373	0.004917	0.003867	0.003366	0.006636	0.013916	0.049387
AE006641	<i>S. solfataricus</i>	2992245	0.007988	0.003279	0.004015	0.002656	0.002072	0.005709	0.012057	0.039543
BA000023	<i>S. tokodaii</i>	2694756	0.009540	0.002887	0.004678	0.002896	0.002598	0.005675	0.010279	0.034593
AL139299	<i>Th. acidophilum</i>	1564906	0.010168	0.012824	0.005046	0.003288	0.003858	0.006748	0.014218	0.055396
BA000011	<i>Th. volcanium</i>	1584804	0.005425	0.006657	0.002924	0.001421	0.002066	0.005435	0.013266	0.054005

an estimation for the maximal value of the information capacity (10). It is evident, that the maximal level of the information capacity would be observed for the case where the reconstructed dictionary $\widetilde{W}_q$ has the maximal absolute entropy, i.e. $\widetilde{f}_{\omega_i} = \widetilde{f}_{\omega_j}, \forall(i, j)$, while the real frequency of the same thickness must be as far from equilibrium, as possible.

Consider an infinitely long periodical sequence from two-letter alphabet $\{0, 1\}$:

$$\dots 01010101\dots,$$

with dictionary W_1 having two words (these are the symbols) with equal frequencies. The dictionary W_2 has only two words: 01 and 10, with equal frequencies, so that $f_{01} = f_{10} = 1/2$, while $f_{11} = f_{00} = 0$. Formula (9b) (see also (10)) yields $\overline{S}_2 = \ln 2$. Consider, then, an infinite periodical sequence

$$\dots \underbrace{1100}_n \dots$$

Again, this sequence exhibits an equilibrium frequency dictionary W_2 and quasi-equilibrium dictionary W_3 ; formula (9a) yields the same value of $\overline{S}_3 = \ln 2$. Similar sequence could be figured out for any equilibrium dictionary W_q ; thus, maximal value of (9) is equal to $\ln 2$ for any q .

The sequence from four-letter alphabet $\aleph = \{A, C, G, T\}$ with equilibrium dictionary W_1 , and quasi-equilibrium dictionary W_2 is evident:

$$\dots \text{ATGCATGCATGC} \dots$$

Formula (9b) yields $\overline{S}_2 = 2 \ln 2$. An infinite periodical sequence $(\text{AACCGGTTGAGCATCT})_n$ provides the same

pattern of dictionaries, with $\overline{S}_3 = 2 \ln 2$. Going this way, one obtains $\overline{S}_q = 2 \ln 2$, for any q .

If a sequence is arranged from an alphabet $\aleph$ of the cardinality M , then the upper level of information capacity (9) for such sequence is equal to

$$\overline{S}_q = \frac{M \cdot \ln 2}{2}.$$

The sense of this relation is clear and obvious: that is the indeterminacy of a choice of a word of the length q from the subset of equally distributed ones, with respect to the fact that only a half of all possible words have positive frequency.

B. Information capacity and redundancy of sequences

Intuitively, redundancy is a measure of an excess of information content observed within a sequence. Traditionally, a redundancy is defined through a two-symbol correlations, or two-symbol entropy calculation, in comparison to a single symbol distribution [26, 27, 28, 29, 30]. A study of information capacity of frequency dictionaries provides a researcher with more advanced definition of the sequence redundancy.

Consider again the chain (1) of dictionaries. A frequency dictionary W_q is the redundant one, if it guarantees an unambiguous reconstruction of thicker dictionary. Critical thickness d^* of the redundant dictionary could be determined constructively; d^* is the thickness yielding uniqueness of any word in it. Some biological issues concerning the determination of d^* for various segments of genes are presented and discussed in [31, 32, 33, 34].

TABLE III: Information capacity (10) of several eukaryotic genomes.

Entry	Chromosome	N	Frequency thickness							
			$q = 2$	$q = 3$	$q = 4$	$q = 5$	$q = 6$	$q = 7$	$q = 8$	$q = 9$
<i>Encephalitozoon cuniculi</i>										
CNS06C8G	I	209982	0.020419	0.010215	0.005647	0.005033	0.009497	0.027366	0.109201	0.318442
CNS07EG9	II	197426	0.019526	0.010266	0.004844	0.003853	0.008743	0.027257	0.109101	0.324783
CNS07EGA	III	194439	0.018463	0.010184	0.004661	0.004254	0.008309	0.028256	0.111627	0.330016
CNS07EGB	IV	218329	0.020161	0.009449	0.004475	0.004010	0.007722	0.024553	0.099807	0.308234
CNS07EGC	V	251002	0.019684	0.010673	0.004171	0.003981	0.008430	0.026259	0.102691	0.309111
AL590446	VI	211018	0.020997	0.010878	0.004720	0.004064	0.008074	0.025227	0.100142	0.302868
AL590447	VII	220294	0.021018	0.009918	0.004688	0.003929	0.007445	0.024660	0.096422	0.297431
AL590448	VIII	226576	0.020570	0.009823	0.004718	0.003770	0.007709	0.023050	0.091410	0.292643
AL590445	IX	238147	0.019905	0.009738	0.004288	0.003486	0.006685	0.022291	0.088252	0.284922
AL590449	X	262797	0.020453	0.010226	0.004451	0.003865	0.006990	0.021142	0.083162	0.271742
AL590450	XI	267509	0.019526	0.009886	0.004695	0.004067	0.006937	0.021279	0.082380	0.271006
<i>Eremothecium gossypii</i>										
AE016814	I	691920	0.004391	0.002940	0.005624	0.001475	0.002799	0.010756	0.029318	0.127641
AE016815	II	867694	0.004230	0.003054	0.004974	0.001441	0.002521	0.009130	0.023515	0.100758
AE016816	III	907057	0.004661	0.002835	0.006406	0.001625	0.002485	0.010476	0.022534	0.096182
AE016817	IV	1466891	0.004174	0.002903	0.005306	0.001186	0.001789	0.007174	0.014014	0.056525
AE016818	V	1519138	0.004194	0.002792	0.005086	0.001239	0.001775	0.006852	0.013755	0.054365
AE016819	VI	1812713	0.004247	0.002820	0.005535	0.001184	0.001736	0.006983	0.011623	0.044951
AE016820	VII	1476021	0.004276	0.002914	0.005688	0.001366	0.001792	0.007751	0.014080	0.056334
<i>Plasmodium falciparum</i>										
AL844501	1	643292	0.004537	0.021562	0.012614	0.016715	0.014143	0.026339	0.043922	0.094463
AE001362	2	947102	0.005162	0.023034	0.010135	0.011752	0.008768	0.017372	0.030138	0.069398
AL844502	3	1060087	0.005085	0.021935	0.010529	0.013345	0.009207	0.016876	0.027924	0.065252
AL844503	4	1204112	0.006206	0.022380	0.011045	0.013383	0.010601	0.019553	0.028004	0.065541
AL844504	5	1343552	0.005692	0.024463	0.009726	0.011810	0.007075	0.013638	0.021777	0.051344
AL844505	6	1418244	0.005632	0.022289	0.009903	0.012013	0.008739	0.016125	0.024536	0.054656
AL844506	7	1351552	0.005754	0.021366	0.010259	0.010999	0.007295	0.014541	0.022528	0.055176
AL844507	8	1325595	0.006079	0.024584	0.010025	0.012517	0.007839	0.014781	0.022590	0.054937
AL844508	9	1541723	0.005251	0.024587	0.009218	0.012546	0.008096	0.014320	0.020518	0.048233
AE014185	10	1694445	0.004614	0.023440	0.011864	0.012760	0.009820	0.017158	0.023704	0.049696
AE014186	11	2035250	0.005433	0.024747	0.009713	0.011386	0.006347	0.012405	0.016579	0.038632
AE014188	12	2271916	0.005712	0.023763	0.009716	0.011348	0.006377	0.011493	0.014971	0.036721
AL844509	13	2732359	0.005614	0.022843	0.008908	0.010828	0.006489	0.011203	0.013794	0.031419
AE014187	14	3291006	0.005750	0.024419	0.008603	0.010351	0.005407	0.009717	0.011047	0.025341
<i>Trypanosoma brucei</i>										
AL929608	1	1056003	0.008134	0.011493	0.011055	0.008356	0.013433	0.026265	0.043841	0.119718
AE017150	2	1193931	0.008328	0.009158	0.008691	0.004800	0.005640	0.013662	0.035133	0.116308
<i>Candida glabrata strain CBS138</i>										
CR380947	A	485192	0.006112	0.002636	0.003803	0.002073	0.003990	0.013642	0.045155	0.174482
CR380948	B	502101	0.006527	0.002561	0.003240	0.001568	0.003522	0.012129	0.042753	0.163491
CR380949	C	558804	0.006026	0.002585	0.003555	0.001937	0.003717	0.012608	0.041452	0.157846
CR380950	D	651701	0.006884	0.002475	0.002945	0.001584	0.002988	0.009860	0.032530	0.128877
CR380951	E	687501	0.006841	0.002654	0.003418	0.001701	0.003165	0.010837	0.033211	0.126183
CR380952	F	927101	0.006915	0.002329	0.002912	0.001432	0.002149	0.007396	0.022390	0.090687
CR380953	G	992211	0.007020	0.002484	0.003094	0.001407	0.002323	0.007444	0.021144	0.085899
CR380954	H	1050361	0.006912	0.002489	0.003002	0.001256	0.002165	0.006884	0.020244	0.081305
CR380955	I	1089401	0.006330	0.002423	0.003010	0.001320	0.002296	0.007551	0.021251	0.081453
CR380956	J	1192501	0.006948	0.002566	0.003183	0.001570	0.002191	0.007090	0.018903	0.073283
CR380957	K	1302002	0.006974	0.002343	0.002822	0.001261	0.001924	0.005637	0.016214	0.064765
CR380958	L	1440588	0.006895	0.002597	0.002882	0.001305	0.001999	0.006217	0.015926	0.060181
CR380959	M	1400893	0.006922	0.002479	0.002850	0.001349	0.001845	0.005611	0.014860	0.060465
<i>Yarrowia lipolytica strain CLIB99</i>										
CR382127	A	2303261	0.007971	0.004445	0.004349	0.002684	0.003795	0.006816	0.012190	0.040135
CR382128	B	3066374	0.007967	0.004337	0.004082	0.002549	0.003753	0.006128	0.009337	0.028461
CR382129	C	3272609	0.008314	0.004102	0.004062	0.002532	0.003487	0.005935	0.009274	0.028189
CR382130	D	3633272	0.008142	0.004317	0.004421	0.002759	0.003827	0.006058	0.008593	0.024927
CR382131	E	4224103	0.008102	0.004520	0.004068	0.002529	0.003677	0.005642	0.007702	0.021561
CR382132	F	4003362	0.007716	0.004372	0.004336	0.002662	0.003557	0.005920	0.007903	0.022481

Definition of redundancy through the length of the longest common repeat is simple and transparent; meanwhile, it has a serious disadvantage. The measure of redundancy tends to N (here N is the length of entire sequence), for rather simple and obviously redundant sequences, such as periodical ones.

On the contrary, the calculation of information capacity is free of that discrepancy. As soon, as $\overline{S}_q = 0$ for some $\overline{q}$, then this thickness of dictionary should be considered as a redundancy measure. Surely, this specific thickness $\overline{q}$ depends both on a structure of a sequence (whatever one understands for that), and on its length.

C. Information capacity of some real genetic systems

Here we present some results of the information capacity (10) determination for real nucleotide sequences. We studied the complete genomes of bacteria and eukaryotes; all the entities are deposited at EMBL-bank.

Table I shows the results of the information capacity calculation for the *Schizosaccharomyces pombe* yeast complete genome and for protozoan *Encephalitozoon cuniculi* complete genome. It is evident, that the pattern of information capacity (10) is bell-shaped. Such pattern results from a finiteness of the length of the original sequence. Indeed, as q approaches the length of 20 nucleotides, the abundance of a complete support of a dictionary becomes equal to 4^{20} ; this number exceeds 10^{12} ; such long genomes are not found yet. The huge number of words follows in a lack of the greater part of them in a dictionary. This exponentially growing abundance follows in a degeneration of a thicker frequency dictionary: the greatest majority of the words occur in a single copy (see section IIIB and [31, 32, 33, 34]).

A study of location and value of maximum of information capacity (10) makes sense for the sequences of a close length. Besides, the location (i.e. the thickness q) of the maximum and its value are both sensitive to a structure of a sequence. A degeneracy of a dictionary follows in a shift of the maximum of (10) to shorter words. The genomes are rather diverse, from that point of view.

The behaviour of information capacity for $2 \leq q \leq 9$ is of the greatest interest. It is evident, that the information capacity (10) varies non-monotonously. An excess of $\overline{S}_2$ over $\overline{S}_3$ is a well known fact [18, 19, 20] with rather clear biological explanation [1, 3, 41]. The occurrence of two or three minima in the information capacity pattern is a newly established fact. It should be said, that a multi-minima pattern is rather widely spread among the studied genomes, while it is not obligatory. The genome of *E.cuniculi* exhibits a single minimum of the information capacity at $q = 5$, for all chromosomes. Table II shows the information capacity for $2 \leq q \leq 9$ for nineteen complete genomes of archaeobacteria. Eleven entities have two minima of the information capacity. This table presents a new phenomenon:

three genomes exhibit an inversion in the information capacity variation at $2 \leq q \leq 4$. These are *Pyrobaculum aerophilum* (identifier AE009441), *Thermoplasma acidophilum* (identifier AL139299) and *Thermoplasma volcanium* (identifier BA000011).

The inversion observed in a family of archaeobacteria could also be observed in other genomes, with various taxonomy. Table III shows the information capacity determined for $2 \leq q \leq 9$ over various eukaryotic genomes. Finally, Table IV presents the most abundant data concerning the behavior of information capacity (10) for over 150 complete genomes of eubacteria. Few words should be said towards the format of this Table. Due to space limitations, all nomenclature of bacteria is provided in a shortened form. Some lines are identified with the same name of a species; it means, that such entities belong to different strains, or different serovariants. The detailed information concerning the taxonomy of the genome could be retrieved from EMBL-bank by an identifier.

IV. DISCUSSION

A researcher capitalizes a lot from the studies of the statistical properties of nucleotide sequences. Here we propose a novel approach towards the definition of the information capacity of a frequency dictionary of a sequence. The key idea of the information capacity definition is the comparison of real and expected frequency of considerably short strings occurred within a symbol sequence. A definition of an expected frequency is the basic problem in the studies of information properties of such entities.

Basically, there are two approaches to identify an expected frequency. The former is to change a sequence under consideration for some surrogate entity with known (or specially prepared) statistical properties, say, consider a realization of some random process [23, 42]. The latter is to figure out the most expected continuation of a string keeping within the information available at the frequency dictionary, only. Changing an original sequence for surrogate one, a student involves into a study outer, additional information. Such intrusion of the additional information may conflict with reliability of the retrieved knowledge and conspire some fine properties of the original sequence.

Studying the statistical properties of symbol sequences, researchers quite often restrict themselves with the consideration of mono- and dinucleotide distribution [8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. A breakthrough in that direction results from the fundamental studies in Boltzmann's equation [35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40], which were successfully converted into the field of bioinformatics [18, 19, 20, 21]. In this paper, we implemented the version of the method of invariant manifolds for figuring out the formula for the most expected continuation of a string. Since the strings are discrete objects, the formula (10) becomes the ex-

TABLE IV: Information capacity (10) of several eukaryotic genomes.

Entry	N	Species	$q = 2$	$q = 3$	$q = 4$	$q = 5$	$q = 6$	$q = 7$	$q = 8$	$q = 9$
CR543861	3598621	<i>Acinetobacter</i> sp.	0.013695	0.006754	0.003180	0.003494	0.003362	0.003889	0.007593	0.025350
AE007870	2841581	<i>Ag.tumefaciens</i>	0.024522	0.012524	0.007616	0.008113	0.004989	0.007159	0.013111	0.042823
AE008689	2074782	<i>Ag.tumefaciens</i>	0.024518	0.012519	0.007616	0.008108	0.004986	0.007162	0.013104	0.042800
AE007869	2841490	<i>Ag.tumefaciens</i>	0.025693	0.013720	0.008115	0.008678	0.005462	0.007398	0.011357	0.032478
AE008688	2075560	<i>Ag.tumefaciens</i>	0.025694	0.013721	0.008115	0.008678	0.005461	0.007397	0.011352	0.032470
AE000657	1551335	<i>Aq.aeolicus</i> VF5	0.025086	0.013949	0.010799	0.006867	0.005535	0.009461	0.016737	0.057694
AE017225	5227293	<i>B.anthraxis</i>	0.005011	0.004804	0.006296	0.003584	0.002930	0.004548	0.006860	0.019529
AE016879	5228310	<i>B.anthraxis</i>	0.005011	0.004803	0.006296	0.003586	0.002928	0.004543	0.006852	0.019510
AE017334	5228663	<i>B.anthraxis</i>	0.005013	0.004802	0.006294	0.003584	0.002926	0.004542	0.006852	0.019509
AE017194	5224283	<i>B.cereus</i>	0.005092	0.004713	0.006247	0.003507	0.002941	0.004795	0.007201	0.020537
AE016877	5411809	<i>B.cereus</i>	0.004948	0.004500	0.006028	0.003295	0.002789	0.004601	0.007054	0.020032
BA000004	4202352	<i>B.halodurans</i>	0.011038	0.003900	0.005231	0.002782	0.001808	0.003647	0.007395	0.024234
AL009126	4214630	<i>B.subtilis</i>	0.016737	0.009942	0.004373	0.001952	0.001894	0.003744	0.006976	0.023948
AE017355	5237682	<i>B.thuringiensis</i>	0.004957	0.004765	0.006262	0.003542	0.002932	0.004808	0.007532	0.021289
AE015928	6260361	<i>B.thetaiotaomicron</i>	0.004681	0.010665	0.006649	0.002838	0.002634	0.003228	0.004825	0.015111
BX897699	1931047	<i>B.henselae</i>	0.015746	0.005150	0.004615	0.002532	0.002570	0.005103	0.013421	0.049652
BX897700	1581384	<i>B.quintana</i>	0.016423	0.004543	0.004067	0.002225	0.002388	0.005020	0.014100	0.056008
BX842601	3782950	<i>B.bacteriovorus</i>	0.021078	0.010726	0.003837	0.004967	0.004054	0.005209	0.008686	0.024182
AE014295	2256646	<i>B.longum</i>	0.013680	0.010854	0.005459	0.007544	0.005795	0.009393	0.013759	0.043138
BX470250	5339179	<i>B.bronchiseptica</i>	0.019051	0.018226	0.014946	0.009624	0.007019	0.014473	0.010739	0.020758
BX470249	4773551	<i>B.parapertussis</i>	0.019309	0.018475	0.015118	0.009716	0.007072	0.014730	0.011562	0.023433
BX470248	4086189	<i>B.pertussis</i>	0.018533	0.018289	0.014508	0.010287	0.010869	0.026770	0.044285	0.097603
AE000783	910724	<i>B.burgdorferi</i>	0.023227	0.002133	0.003246	0.002873	0.003887	0.009814	0.024221	0.076756
BA000040	9105828	<i>B.japonicum</i>	0.027282	0.009713	0.008155	0.006690	0.004230	0.007997	0.006765	0.013241
AE008917	2117144	<i>B.melitensis</i> , chr.I	0.028077	0.011210	0.006071	0.007949	0.007784	0.007177	0.013674	0.043426
AE008918	1177787	<i>B.melitensis</i> , chr.II	0.028054	0.010904	0.006750	0.008201	0.008306	0.008633	0.020434	0.070601
AE014291	2107793	<i>B.suis</i> 1330, chr.I	0.028299	0.011342	0.006123	0.008063	0.007878	0.007275	0.013840	0.043651
AE014292	1207381	<i>B.suis</i> , chr.II	0.027777	0.010778	0.006642	0.008118	0.008243	0.008567	0.019980	0.069020
BA000003	640681	<i>B.aphidicola</i>	0.007608	0.004984	0.007715	0.002464	0.004401	0.011496	0.033328	0.100963
AE016826	615980	<i>B.aphidicola</i>	0.004517	0.004223	0.005281	0.002105	0.004130	0.011172	0.034193	0.097610
AE013218	641454	<i>B.aphidicola</i>	0.010056	0.005607	0.007001	0.002654	0.004619	0.011923	0.032871	0.093878
AL111168	1641481	<i>C.jejuni</i>	0.025925	0.007195	0.008380	0.006480	0.006136	0.009552	0.017044	0.049726
BX248583	705557	<i>B.floridanus</i>	0.004191	0.004090	0.004874	0.002726	0.004370	0.010925	0.030405	0.093783
AE005673	4016947	<i>C.crescentus</i>	0.015292	0.022869	0.012056	0.012406	0.011076	0.028279	0.070484	0.163516
AE002160	1072950	<i>Ch.muridarum</i>	0.015077	0.005375	0.002794	0.002095	0.002951	0.006255	0.019863	0.078997
AE001273	1042519	<i>Ch.trachomatis</i>	0.013610	0.005905	0.003162	0.002003	0.002976	0.006651	0.020558	0.082006
AE015925	1173390	<i>Ch.caviae</i>	0.010397	0.005354	0.003291	0.003658	0.004232	0.006445	0.018200	0.072489
AE002161	1229853	<i>Ch.pneumoniae</i>	0.013529	0.004222	0.002565	0.003561	0.003454	0.006385	0.017356	0.069847
AE001363	1230230	<i>Ch.pneumoniae</i>	0.013530	0.004219	0.002566	0.003566	0.003454	0.006398	0.017363	0.069779
BA000008	1226565	<i>Ch.pneumoniae</i>	0.013539	0.004219	0.002549	0.003553	0.003438	0.006368	0.017319	0.069720
AE009440	1225935	<i>Ch.pneumoniae</i>	0.013506	0.004219	0.002566	0.003564	0.003453	0.006393	0.017342	0.069793
AE006470	2154946	<i>C.tepidum</i>	0.020061	0.011061	0.008408	0.006773	0.008106	0.008369	0.012377	0.041511
AE016825	4751080	<i>C.violaceum</i>	0.019041	0.018825	0.014015	0.009803	0.007443	0.016733	0.011386	0.024193
AE001437	3940880	<i>C.acetobutylicum</i>	0.010606	0.005123	0.004222	0.001690	0.002404	0.005410	0.008253	0.025033
BA000016	3031430	<i>C.perfringens</i>	0.017457	0.004479	0.005310	0.002498	0.004307	0.008116	0.011921	0.030875
AE015927	2799251	<i>C.tetani</i>	0.014410	0.006102	0.006276	0.002459	0.003594	0.006788	0.010479	0.031232
BX248353	2488635	<i>C.diphtheriae</i>	0.007448	0.003906	0.005199	0.004450	0.003300	0.005425	0.010729	0.035929
BA000035	3147090	<i>C.efficientis</i>	0.013561	0.010039	0.011470	0.009562	0.006170	0.009947	0.013196	0.034160
AX114121	3309400	<i>C.glutamicum</i>	0.011670	0.005214	0.004643	0.005185	0.003740	0.005143	0.009104	0.027874
BA000036	3309401	<i>C.glutamicum</i>	0.011670	0.005214	0.004643	0.005185	0.003740	0.005143	0.009104	0.027873
BX927147	3282708	<i>C.glutamicum</i>	0.011725	0.005243	0.004649	0.005196	0.003758	0.005142	0.009162	0.028107
AE016828	1995275	<i>C.burnetii</i> strain	0.020865	0.001531	0.004846	0.001590	0.002105	0.004843	0.012999	0.047250
AE000513	2648638	<i>D.radiodurans</i> , chr.1	0.010846	0.008048	0.013872	0.009601	0.016747	0.013908	0.015656	0.038380
AE001825	412348	<i>D.radiodurans</i> , chr.2	0.010821	0.007962	0.014203	0.009626	0.018188	0.022831	0.054850	0.149147
AE017285	3570858	<i>D.vulgaris</i>	0.010306	0.013164	0.009729	0.010660	0.007107	0.007437	0.009646	0.026623
AE016830	3218031	<i>E.faecalis</i>	0.013746	0.002634	0.005872	0.002905	0.003065	0.004865	0.008791	0.028356
BX950851	5231428	<i>E.carotovora</i>	0.011198	0.010238	0.006360	0.005196	0.003841	0.003902	0.006142	0.018491
AE014075	4639675	<i>E.coli</i>	0.011808	0.012713	0.008453	0.004938	0.004337	0.003890	0.006233	0.018843
U00096	5498450	<i>E.coli</i> K-12	0.012761	0.012604	0.008689	0.005368	0.004935	0.004300	0.007042	0.021171
AE005174	5528970	<i>E.coli</i>	0.011766	0.012788	0.008379	0.004734	0.004253	0.004040	0.006233	0.018996
BA000007	2174500	<i>E.coli</i>	0.011825	0.012822	0.008422	0.004794	0.004350	0.004063	0.006187	0.018753

AE009951	3814139	<i>F.nucleatum</i>	0.021164	0.005779	0.009750	0.003532	0.006993	0.009325	0.013460	0.034533
AE017180	4659019	<i>G.sulfurreducens</i>	0.009219	0.007008	0.010504	0.005446	0.004269	0.008725	0.009014	0.025514
BA000045	1698955	<i>G.violaceus</i>	0.010012	0.009740	0.010249	0.006336	0.006289	0.008805	0.009177	0.021508
AE017143	1830138	<i>H.ducreyi</i>	0.014763	0.004629	0.006226	0.004448	0.004560	0.006575	0.015308	0.055473
L42023	1799146	<i>H.influenzae</i>	0.017150	0.004225	0.007368	0.005328	0.006523	0.007372	0.015226	0.050344
AE017125	1667867	<i>H.hepaticus</i>	0.018702	0.014497	0.014539	0.008144	0.008877	0.007023	0.013430	0.041564
AE000511	1643831	<i>H.pylori</i>	0.030840	0.015429	0.015576	0.012382	0.008501	0.008442	0.016689	0.050142
AE001439	1992676	<i>H.pylori</i>	0.030502	0.015549	0.015428	0.012521	0.008944	0.008466	0.017338	0.051273
AE017198	3308274	<i>L.johnsonii</i>	0.009143	0.004275	0.004558	0.002686	0.003695	0.006929	0.014344	0.047679
AL935263	2365589	<i>L.plantarum</i>	0.008293	0.010481	0.003223	0.001675	0.002355	0.003553	0.007938	0.026947
AE005176	350181	<i>L.lactis</i>	0.016683	0.003346	0.006059	0.002677	0.004539	0.006436	0.013119	0.042277
AE010300	4277185	<i>L.interrogans, chr.I</i>	0.023489	0.005030	0.004597	0.003392	0.003288	0.006140	0.010908	0.028291
AE010301	4332241	<i>L.interrogans, chr.II</i>	0.023718	0.005441	0.004555	0.004094	0.006199	0.017972	0.063814	0.187752
AE016824	358943	<i>L.interrogans, chr.II</i>	0.024007	0.005584	0.004553	0.004111	0.006322	0.017950	0.064234	0.188090
AE016823	3011208	<i>L.interrogans</i>	0.023558	0.005155	0.004588	0.003391	0.003247	0.005877	0.010228	0.026687
AL592022	2944528	<i>L.innocua</i>	0.011179	0.003573	0.005686	0.003151	0.003294	0.005174	0.009607	0.030576
AL591824	2905310	<i>L.monocytogenes</i>	0.011396	0.003882	0.005642	0.003037	0.003048	0.005090	0.009756	0.031100
AE017262	7036071	<i>L.monocytogenes</i>	0.011505	0.003916	0.005730	0.003086	0.003073	0.004978	0.009834	0.031566
BA000012	4829781	<i>M.loti</i>	0.024233	0.015134	0.008290	0.007213	0.004327	0.006993	0.006814	0.015281
AE016958	4345492	<i>M.avium</i>	0.014324	0.015800	0.014565	0.009668	0.006895	0.012516	0.009742	0.021269
BX248333	3268203	<i>M.bovis</i>	0.011931	0.013305	0.006231	0.005685	0.003712	0.005707	0.008096	0.021289
AL450380	4403836	<i>M.leprae</i>	0.006510	0.009074	0.003134	0.002974	0.001870	0.003343	0.007997	0.026873
AE000516	4411532	<i>M.tuberculosis</i>	0.011986	0.013288	0.006198	0.005666	0.003707	0.005629	0.007962	0.020983
AL123456	996422	<i>M.tuberculosis</i>	0.011921	0.013306	0.006187	0.005689	0.003735	0.005692	0.008128	0.021367
AE015450	580074	<i>M.gallisepticum</i>	0.006701	0.015753	0.006583	0.004337	0.004985	0.010510	0.027155	0.079118
L43967	777079	<i>M.genitalium</i>	0.022383	0.011217	0.006594	0.004153	0.006728	0.014388	0.039278	0.106222
AE017308	1211703	<i>M.mobile</i>	0.025882	0.002351	0.006275	0.004904	0.006123	0.012948	0.028369	0.071083
BX293980	1358633	<i>M.mycoides</i>	0.013469	0.005017	0.007949	0.005886	0.008636	0.018970	0.036735	0.074542
BA000026	816394	<i>M.penetrans</i>	0.019534	0.004346	0.005586	0.004174	0.005411	0.009853	0.017731	0.044553
U00089	963879	<i>M.pneumoniae</i>	0.018826	0.007344	0.005417	0.004906	0.006282	0.013033	0.035947	0.115842
AL445566	2272351	<i>M.pulmonis</i>	0.031785	0.003381	0.006229	0.004446	0.006995	0.012152	0.025206	0.062292
AL157959	2184406	<i>N.meningitidis</i>	0.029480	0.010012	0.014966	0.012269	0.012474	0.016027	0.022912	0.054354
AE002098	2812094	<i>N.meningitidis</i>	0.028833	0.010041	0.014901	0.011777	0.011893	0.015318	0.021837	0.053141
AL954747	6413771	<i>N.europaea</i>	0.012756	0.015878	0.005756	0.003580	0.002610	0.004525	0.010362	0.035089
BA000019	3630528	<i>Nostoc sp.</i>	0.007019	0.004369	0.007128	0.005647	0.008247	0.004818	0.006080	0.015953
BA000028	860631	<i>O.ihayensis</i>	0.004552	0.003903	0.004959	0.002415	0.001995	0.004403	0.008011	0.026023
AP006628	2414465	<i>Phytoplasma OY-M</i>	0.024347	0.002811	0.009253	0.004726	0.006011	0.013248	0.034387	0.093834
BX908798	2257487	<i>P.symbiont UWE25</i>	0.019051	0.000800	0.002495	0.001469	0.002191	0.005323	0.011907	0.040491
AE004439	5064019	<i>P.multocida</i>	0.013903	0.003047	0.005737	0.004126	0.004863	0.005956	0.011835	0.040879
CR354531	4085304	<i>Ph.profundum, chr.1</i>	0.007148	0.006235	0.004428	0.002712	0.002584	0.004022	0.008711	0.028081
CR354532	2237943	<i>Ph.profundum, chr.2</i>	0.007086	0.004927	0.004542	0.002733	0.002916	0.005705	0.015656	0.051976
BX470251	5688987	<i>Ph.luminescens</i>	0.008510	0.006521	0.005386	0.002895	0.003332	0.004364	0.008499	0.022554
BX119912	7145576	<i>Pirellula sp.</i>	0.017458	0.001464	0.003464	0.001879	0.003685	0.005981	0.013366	0.048556
AE015924	2343476	<i>P.gingivalis</i>	0.007081	0.010317	0.006542	0.004243	0.003609	0.006069	0.013509	0.044284
BX548174	2410873	<i>P.marinus</i>	0.018590	0.005901	0.003325	0.002806	0.002921	0.004667	0.009789	0.034915
BX548175	1751080	<i>P.marinus</i>	0.014293	0.013618	0.008557	0.005447	0.004080	0.004461	0.006502	0.019154
AE017126	1657990	<i>P.marinus</i>	0.017482	0.001875	0.002785	0.002210	0.003777	0.005237	0.012796	0.047272
AE004091	6264403	<i>P.aeruginosa</i>	0.011202	0.021308	0.014929	0.012606	0.007620	0.013218	0.010158	0.019504
AE015451	6181863	<i>P.putida</i>	0.012929	0.016990	0.007108	0.008053	0.004959	0.007802	0.008244	0.018798
AE016853	6397126	<i>P.syringae</i>	0.015843	0.012798	0.005311	0.006846	0.005050	0.005531	0.007981	0.019878
AL646052	3716413	<i>R.solanacearum</i>	0.021411	0.013736	0.010764	0.008860	0.005842	0.012073	0.011065	0.027009
AE006914	5459213	<i>R.conorii</i>	0.007552	0.005067	0.006533	0.003395	0.004597	0.009335	0.021696	0.068644
AJ235269	1268755	<i>R.prowazekii</i>	0.005170	0.002927	0.004268	0.002387	0.003076	0.007000	0.019457	0.067786
AL513382	1111523	<i>S.enterica</i>	0.013751	0.013405	0.008223	0.005347	0.003932	0.004370	0.006655	0.019728
AE014613	4791961	<i>S.enterica</i>	0.013820	0.013388	0.008231	0.005328	0.003932	0.004410	0.006684	0.019829
AE006468	4809037	<i>S.typhimurium</i>	0.014293	0.013618	0.008557	0.005447	0.004080	0.004461	0.006502	0.019154
AE014299	4857432	<i>Sh.oneidensis</i>	0.010458	0.006262	0.004642	0.004382	0.003284	0.003841	0.007949	0.023929
AE014073	4969803	<i>Sh.flexneri</i>	0.011760	0.012701	0.008109	0.005166	0.005014	0.005425	0.011490	0.031813
AE005674	4607203	<i>Sh.flexneri</i>	0.011748	0.012673	0.008080	0.005184	0.005035	0.005501	0.011795	0.032345
AL591688	4599354	<i>S.meliloti</i>	0.026681	0.010958	0.007164	0.006438	0.003565	0.007529	0.009891	0.027683
BX571856	2902619	<i>St.aureus</i>	0.005913	0.002068	0.005134	0.002628	0.003085	0.005770	0.010129	0.032952
BX571857	2799802	<i>St.aureus</i>	0.005964	0.002117	0.005290	0.002717	0.003144	0.005981	0.010413	0.033942

BA000017	2820462	<i>St.aureus</i>	0.005854	0.002085	0.005151	0.002687	0.003078	0.005765	0.010071	0.032912
BA000033	2878529	<i>St.aureus</i>	0.005982	0.002104	0.005273	0.002719	0.003128	0.005970	0.010400	0.033816
BA000018	2814816	<i>St.aureus</i>	0.005914	0.002130	0.005207	0.002716	0.003127	0.005906	0.010446	0.034171
AE015929	2499279	<i>St.epidermidis</i>	0.003767	0.001716	0.004630	0.002240	0.002595	0.006244	0.011690	0.038364
AE009948	2160267	<i>St.agalactiae</i>	0.006904	0.002936	0.005024	0.001858	0.002747	0.005824	0.013064	0.044783
AL732656	2211485	<i>St.agalactiae</i>	0.007217	0.002855	0.005103	0.001912	0.002754	0.005794	0.012886	0.044199
AE014133	2030921	<i>St.mutans</i>	0.013456	0.004012	0.005658	0.002547	0.002924	0.005414	0.012257	0.044677
AE007317	2038615	<i>St.pneumoniae</i>	0.011668	0.004819	0.005481	0.002696	0.003326	0.006172	0.013436	0.046620
AE005672	2160837	<i>St.pneumoniae</i>	0.011575	0.004695	0.005364	0.002744	0.003515	0.007163	0.014714	0.047388
AE004092	1852441	<i>St.pyogenes</i>	0.010333	0.004626	0.004952	0.002287	0.002627	0.005484	0.013313	0.048073
AE014074	1900521	<i>St.pyogenes</i>	0.010106	0.004583	0.004939	0.002203	0.002613	0.005468	0.013328	0.048020
BA000034	1895017	<i>St.pyogenes</i>	0.010166	0.004620	0.004978	0.002213	0.002580	0.005414	0.013187	0.047412
AE009949	1894275	<i>St.pyogenes</i>	0.010180	0.004543	0.004911	0.002241	0.002626	0.005417	0.013576	0.048444
BA000030	9025608	<i>St.avermitilis</i>	0.011393	0.010642	0.010511	0.007005	0.006183	0.009745	0.006162	0.012784
AL645882	8667507	<i>St.coelicolor</i>	0.011072	0.011860	0.012735	0.007970	0.007255	0.011645	0.006942	0.013581
BX548020	2434428	<i>Synechococcus sp.</i>	0.017464	0.011350	0.007426	0.005454	0.003216	0.007177	0.011822	0.038270
BA000022	3573470	<i>Synechocystis sp.</i>	0.023278	0.004463	0.008626	0.009390	0.006909	0.006308	0.009156	0.026581
AE008691	2689445	<i>Th.tengcongensis</i>	0.018306	0.007426	0.006789	0.002851	0.003094	0.006214	0.011581	0.038095
BA000039	2593857	<i>Th.elongatus</i>	0.015134	0.004435	0.008833	0.008839	0.007238	0.007249	0.013275	0.040696
AE000512	1860725	<i>Th.maritima</i>	0.028543	0.017235	0.006157	0.003558	0.003491	0.006186	0.013606	0.047372
AE017221	1894877	<i>Th.thermophilus</i>	0.030010	0.028048	0.020868	0.021224	0.014340	0.019560	0.020008	0.040026
AE017226	2843201	<i>T.denticola</i>	0.020824	0.012443	0.007493	0.003559	0.002909	0.005231	0.009348	0.031935
AE000520	1138011	<i>T.pallidum</i>	0.008565	0.013489	0.004322	0.002325	0.002653	0.006578	0.018883	0.077105
AE014184	925938	<i>T.whipplei</i>	0.005901	0.006857	0.003644	0.002028	0.004167	0.008065	0.026251	0.103984
BX072543	927303	<i>T.whipplei</i>	0.005888	0.006799	0.003663	0.002031	0.004196	0.008171	0.026376	0.103937
AF222894	751719	<i>U.urealyticum</i>	0.012392	0.005304	0.008392	0.003739	0.005607	0.013331	0.030211	0.081295
AE003852	2961149	<i>V.cholerae, chr.I</i>	0.012525	0.008069	0.003458	0.005102	0.003751	0.004211	0.009380	0.031341
AE003853	1072315	<i>V.cholerae, chr.II</i>	0.013503	0.006883	0.003994	0.005358	0.005951	0.010563	0.026775	0.088844
BA000031	3288558	<i>V.parahaemolyticus, chr.1</i>	0.010957	0.006585	0.003386	0.003249	0.002822	0.003810	0.008719	0.028953
BA000032	1877212	<i>V.parahaemolyticus, chr.2</i>	0.012741	0.005847	0.003816	0.003567	0.003113	0.004436	0.012061	0.045329
AE016795	3281945	<i>V.vulnificus, chr.I</i>	0.012698	0.006581	0.003817	0.003317	0.002780	0.003857	0.009136	0.029434
AE016796	1844853	<i>V.vulnificus, chr.II</i>	0.014850	0.006728	0.004751	0.004073	0.003228	0.004387	0.012116	0.045682
BA000037	3354505	<i>V.vulnificus, chr.I</i>	0.012488	0.006641	0.003806	0.003326	0.002752	0.003844	0.009066	0.029050
BA000038	1857073	<i>V.vulnificus, chr.II</i>	0.014921	0.006935	0.004853	0.004106	0.003306	0.004377	0.012018	0.045477
BA000021	697724	<i>W.glossinidia</i>	0.014766	0.007419	0.006667	0.002547	0.005068	0.011597	0.029992	0.080185
AE017196	1267782	<i>W.endosymbiont</i>	0.009537	0.003220	0.003734	0.002173	0.004236	0.009704	0.024983	0.077065
BX571656	2110355	<i>W.succinogenes</i>	0.028493	0.021856	0.012718	0.008349	0.006376	0.006379	0.013819	0.043435
AE008923	5175554	<i>X.axonopodis</i>	0.024169	0.014838	0.007583	0.008203	0.004462	0.008442	0.008844	0.020333
AE008922	5076188	<i>X.campestris</i>	0.023799	0.014241	0.008130	0.008585	0.004921	0.009403	0.009628	0.022067
AE003849	2679306	<i>X.fastidiosa</i>	0.011826	0.003955	0.004727	0.003342	0.003024	0.004914	0.009535	0.033301
AE009442	2519802	<i>X.fastidiosa</i>	0.011900	0.004018	0.004997	0.003470	0.003060	0.005249	0.010488	0.036900
AE017042	4595065	<i>Y.pestis</i>	0.009359	0.008596	0.005810	0.003897	0.003320	0.003660	0.007726	0.024715
AE009952	4600755	<i>Y.pestis</i>	0.009320	0.008555	0.005798	0.003861	0.003332	0.003717	0.008030	0.025373
AL590842	4653728	<i>Y.pestis</i>	0.009318	0.008568	0.005805	0.003873	0.003394	0.003911	0.008721	0.026808

act solution, on the contrary to the situation of a typical physical situation [22, 36, 38].

Zero information capacity of a frequency dictionary W_q means the exact and unambiguous extension of the given dictionary into any thicker one W_k , $k > q$. This point provides a student with the new tool to define a redundancy of a frequency dictionary. Further, we shall understand the redundancy of a dictionary for the redundancy of a sequence itself. There is a simpler way to define the redundancy; it is based on the determination of the longest repeat within a sequence [31, 32, 33, 34]. It was found that the redundancy of introns exceeds that latter for exons, and the splicing results in a decrease of a general gene redundancy. Meanwhile, it should be stressed, that this simple method of the redundancy de-

termination fails to figure out the situations of highly ordered (e.g. periodical) sequences. The definition of redundancy through an information capacity calculation is free from that discrepancy. It should be kept in mind, that zero value of (10) does not automatically yield an exact and unambiguous reconstruction of a thicker finite dictionary $\mathfrak{F}_q$. A redundancy, then, is to be considered in two interrelated but individual ways; the former is the measure defined through the $\mathfrak{F}_{d^*}$ perfect expansion up to an entire symbol sequence, and the latter is a high level of predictability of a continuation of each word.

A. Markov models and maximum entropy principle

Study of nucleotide sequences with the Markovian processes is rather popular [23, 42]. The motivation behind such popularity is quite transparent: Markov process provides a researcher with numerous ways to fit a specific realization of the process to a given symbol sequence. Basic idea of a search of so called hidden Markov models of a nucleotide sequence consists in a choice of the minimal order Markov process, which matches the sequence satisfactory. It should be said, that this approach distinguishes quite properly coding regions of a genome vs. the non-coding ones [42]. The invariance in triplet distribution found for non-coding regions accompanied with a distinct and well structured pattern of a triplet distribution observed within coding regions [5, 6, 7] makes such good efficiency of Markov models for separation of coding vs. non-coding regions evident.

Formally speaking, there always exists a Markov process, that perfectly fits a sequence. Indeed, Markov process of the d^* order developed over a sequence would match this latter perfectly, with no variations, at all. Obviously, such Markov model brings no biological inspiration. Nevertheless, a search for minimal order Markov process matching a sequence may make sense. The key idea of a separation of coding regions from the non-coding ones due to Markov models consists in a seeking for the points of an abrupt change in the order of the relevant process. More fine and effective approach furthering the hidden Markov model is discussed in Section IV C.

B. On a fractal structure of genomes

Comprehensive investigations of statistical properties of nucleotide sequences reveal some interesting (and important) features of that latter. Researchers identify various fractal structures and fractal-like patterns within genetic entities [43, 44]. Probably, the nucleotide sequences are quite complex object exhibiting a great variety of properties, including those, which are suspected to be a fractal pattern. A study of information capacity reveals an increased correlation in a combinations of various strings through the non-monotonic behaviour of that latter observed at different length q of words.

Examination of the tables shows a presence of the genomes that exhibit one, two or three local minima of information capacity (10). Local minimum observed at the length l means that some combinations of two words of that length prevail among the others. Correlations in short strings occurrence is evident, if several minima of information capacity are observed. The correlations among some short strings are less evident, if a single minimum is observed within a sequence. The point is that such single minimum may result from a finite sampling of a sequence.

Nonetheless, one hardly could explain an occurrence of a single minimum of information capacity (10) by a finite

sampling effect, solely. The point is, that the location of such single minimum varies significantly, for various bacterial genomes. Suppose, the location of the single minimum of information capacity is determined by the finite sampling effect; then, the specific length q of words where the minimum is observed should be the same, for all such genomes. This follows from the dependence of the maximum of (10); that former is defined mainly by the finite sampling effect. Basically, the finite sampling effect would manifest through the logarithmic dependence of the position of the maximum (and the minimum, in turn) on the length of a sequence. Observed diversity of the lengths where the minimum occurs breaks down the original supposition. Thus, the local minima (with no respect to the number of these latter observed within a sequence) represent a structure, which might be considered as a fractal pattern; detailed discussion of that matter falls beyond the scope of the paper.

C. Information valuable words

Let's have a look at the definition of information capacity (7). It is evident, that the major contribution into the sum is provided by the terms with the highest possible deviation of real frequency f_ω from the most expected one $\tilde{f}_\omega$. These are the words of increased information value. More exactly, α , $\alpha > 1$ be the information value threshold. A word ω' is of information value, if it falls out of the range determined by the double inequality

$$\alpha^{-1} \leq \frac{f_{\omega'}}{\tilde{f}_{\omega'}} \leq \alpha. \quad (11)$$

There are two types of information valuable words: the former are the words with an excess of real frequency over the expected one, and the latter are the words with an excess of expected frequency over the real one. We call the words of the first type (of the second type, respectively) the ascending ones (the descending ones, respectively). Whether a word ω is of information value, or not, depends on a structure of a sequence, of the threshold α , and on the length q of a word.

Of course, the choice of α value still is the matter of expertise of a student. There is no formal way to put on the α level. To clarify this point, one has to study the distribution of the words at a dictionary W_q over their information value $p = \frac{f_\omega}{\tilde{f}_\omega}$. While the expected frequency $\tilde{f}_\omega$ is explicitly derived from the real frequency of the words (see (4)), less is known towards the distribution of words over the real (and expected, in turn) frequency.

Obviously, $p_{\max}$ and $p_{\min}$ depend on a structure of nucleotide sequence. An estimation for $p_{\min}$ is apparent: $\min p_{\min} = 0$; less is known concerning the estimation of $p_{\max}$. To clarify this point, more studies should be carried out; they fall beyond the scope of this paper.

Suppose, the threshold value α is put on. The threshold identifies two sets of information valuable words; the

former is the ascending one, and the latter is descending one. A quality of being the information valuable word has no monotony: given ascending information valuable word $\bar{\omega}$ (descending word $\underline{\omega}$, respectively) of the length q may be embedded into a longer one, or may be not. Moreover, if no embedment is found for one symbol longer information valuable words, one can not guarantee the embedment absence into the information valuable words of the length l , where $l > q + 1$. Besides, a longer information valuable word may incorporate a shorter one with the opposite order of p .

Consider the uniform sets of information valuable words of increasing length:

$$\{\bar{\omega}_3\}, \{\bar{\omega}_4\}, \dots, \{\bar{\omega}_q\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{\underline{\omega}_3\}, \{\underline{\omega}_4\}, \dots, \{\underline{\omega}_q\},$$

identified for given $\alpha > 1$. A chain

$$\bar{\omega}_3 \subset \bar{\omega}_4 \subset \dots \subset \bar{\omega}_k \quad (12a)$$

or

$$\underline{\omega}_3 \subset \underline{\omega}_4 \subset \dots \subset \underline{\omega}_k \quad (12b)$$

is the ascending shoot or descending shoot, respectively. The shortest word within a shoot (12) is a **root**, and the longest one is an **apex**. A union of all the shoots with the same root makes a **pyramid**. Thus, a pyramid may be an ascending, or a descending one. An information

valuable word is an entity, where given Markov model changes for another one (of the other order, etc.). A pyramid gathers the entities where the variation of the relevant Markov model takes place in coordination, for all the scales $3 \leq q \leq k$. Obviously, a simultaneous change of a Markov model could hardly take place occasionally. Hence, the apices of the pyramids (12) identifies the sites within a genome.

A study of distribution of the apices alongside a genome [21, 45] shows a high level of the correlation between a location of the apices, and the functional role of the sites, where they occur. Such study makes a core of very promising approach in the investigations of the relation of structure and function of biological macromolecules, while the detail discussion of that subject falls beyond the scope of this paper.

Acknowledgments

I would like to extend my gratitude to Prof. Alexander N. Gorban from the University of Leicester for long-time collaboration and permanent encouraging interest to the work, and to Dr. Tatyana G. Popova who draw my attention to the non-monotonicity of the information capacity variation. I would like also to thank Marina A. Makarova for help with calculations.

-
- [1] W.-H. Li, *Molecular Evolution* (Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, 1997).
 - [2] *Computational Models in Molecular Biology*, edited by S.L. Sazberg, D.B. Searls, and S. Kasif (Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1998).
 - [3] J.K. Percus, *Mathematics of Genome Analysis* (Columbia University Press, Cambridge, 2002).
 - [4] A.K. Konopka, All we need is truth. // *Comput. Biol. Chem.* (2004) **28**(1), 1–2.
 - [5] A.Yu. Zinovjev, A.N. Gorban, T.G. Popova, Seven clusters in genomic triplet distribution. In *Silico Biology* (2003) **3**, 471–482.
 - [6] A.N. Gorban, A.Yu. Zinovjev, T.G. Popova, Self-organizing approach for automated gene identification. // *Open Systems & Information Dyn.* 2003 **10**, 321–333.
 - [7] A. Carbone, A. Zinovjev, F. Kepes, Codon Adaptation Index as a measure of dominating codon bias. // *Bioinformatics.* (2003) **19**, 2005–2015.
 - [8] S. Havlin, S.V. Buldyrev, A.L. Goldberger, R.N. Mantegna, C.K. Peng, M. Simons, H.E. Stanley, Statistical and linguistic features of DNA sequences. // *Fractals* (1995) **3**, 269–284.
 - [9] L. Allison, L. Stern, T. Edgoose, T.I. Dix, Sequence complexity for biological sequence analysis. // *Comput. Chem.* (2000) **24**(1), 43–55.
 - [10] V.N. Babenko, P.S. Kosarev, O.V. Vishnevsky, V.G. Levitsky, V.V. Basin, A.S. Frolov, Investigating extended regulatory regions of genomic DNA sequences. // *Bioinformatics* (1999) **15**, 644–653.
 - [11] V.D. Gusev, L.A. Nemytikova, N.A. Chuzhanova, On the complexity measures of genetic sequences. // *Bioinformatics* (1999) **15**, 994–999.
 - [12] E. Pizzi, C. Frontali, Low-Complexity Regions in Plasmodium falciparum Proteins. // *Genome Res.* (2001) **11**, 218–229.
 - [13] H.E. Stanley, S.V. Buldyrev, A.L. Goldberger, S. Havlin, C.K. Peng, M. Simons, Scaling features of noncoding DNA. // *Physica A* (1999) **273**, 1–18.
 - [14] P. Romero, Z. Obradovic, X. Li, E.C. Garner, C.J. Brown, A.K. Dunker, Sequence complexity of disordered protein. // *Proteins.* (2001) **42**(1), 38–48.
 - [15] M.A. Jiménez-Montaña, W. Ebeling, Th. Pohl, P.E. Rapp, Entropy and complexity of finite sequences as fluctuating quantities // *BioSystems* (2002) **64**, 23–32.
 - [16] E.O. Gorbunova, Yu.V. Kondratenko, M.G. Sadovsky, Data loss reparation due to indeterminate fine-grained parallel computation. // P.M.A. Sloot et al. (Eds.) ICCS 2003, LNCS 2658, Springer-Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 2003, pp. 794–801.
 - [17] E.O. Nemechinskaya, Yu.V. Kondratenko, M.G. Sadovsky, Entropy based approach to data loss reparation through the indeterminate fine-grained parallel computation. // *Open Systems & Information Dyn.* (2004) **11**(2), pp. 161–175.
 - [18] N.N. Bugaenko, A.N. Gorban, M.G. Sadovsky, Towards the definition of information content of nucleotide sequences. // *Molecular biology Moscow.* (1996) **30**, # 5, 529–541.

- [19] N.N.Bugaenko, A.N.Gorban, M.G.Sadovsky, The information capacity of nucleotide sequences and their fragments. // *Biophysics*. (1997) **5**, 1063–1069.
- [20] N.N.Bugaenko, A.N.Gorban, M.G.Sadovsky, Maximum entropy method in analysis of genetic text and measurement of its information content. // *Open Systems & Information Dyn.* (1998) **5**, # 2, 265–278.
- [21] Rui Hu, Bin Wanga, Statistically significant strings are related to regulatory elements in the promoter regions of *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. // *Physica A* (2001) **290**, 464–474.
- [22] J.Kirkwood, E.Boggs, The radial distribution function in liquids. // *J.Chem. Physics* (1942) **10**, # 6, p.394.
- [23] M.S.Gelfand, Prediction of function in DNA sequence analysis. // *J.Comput.Biology* (1995) **2**, pp.87–115.
- [24] R.Balesçu, *Balance and imbalance statistical physics* (Sineauer Associates, Sunderland, MA, 1997).
- [25] A.N.Gorban, *Equilibrium encircling*. Nauka plc.: 1984, Novosibirsk. 268 p.
- [26] M.J.Berryman, A.Allison, D.Abbott, Mutual information for examining correlations in DNA. // arXiv:q-bio.PE/0404010v1; 7 April, 2004.
- [27] Bailin Hao, Huimin Xie, Zuguo Yu, Guoyi Chen, Avoided Strings in Bacterial Complete Genomes and a Related Combinatorial Problem. // *Annals of Combinatorics* (2000) **4**, 247–255.
- [28] J.G.Wolff, Mathematics and logic as information compression by multiple alignment, unification and search. // arXiv:math.GM/0308153v1 15 August, 2003.
- [29] M.Li, P.Vitányi, *An Introduction to Kolmogorov Complexity and Its Applications*. Springer-Verlag: 1997, New York.
- [30] C.E.Shannon, W.Weaver, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. University of Illinois Press: 1949, Urbana.
- [31] T.G.Popova, M.G.Sadovsky, Splicing results in decrease of gene redundancy. // *Molecular Biology Moscow* (1995) **29**(3), 500–506.
- [32] T.G.Popova, M.G.Sadovsky, Introns differ from exons in their redundancy. // *Rus.J.of Genetics* (1995) **31**(10), 1365–1369.
- [33] A.N.Gorban, T.G.Popova, M.G.Sadovsky, Human viruses genes are less redundant than the human genes. // *Rus.J.of Genetics* (1996) **32**(2), 281–294.
- [34] M.G.Sadovsky, On the redundancy of viral and prokaryotic genomes. // *Rus.J.of Genetics* (2002) **38**(5), 695–701.
- [35] A.N.Gorban, I.V.Karlin, Method of invariant manifolds and regularization of acoustic spectra. // *Transport Theory and Stat.Phys.* (1994) **23**, 559–632.
- [36] A.N.Gorban, I.V.Karlin, General approach to constructing models of the Boltzmann equation. // *Physica A* (1994) **206**, 401–420.
- [37] I.V.Karlin, A.N.Gorban, G.Dukek, T.F.Nonnenmacher, Dynamic correction to moment approximations. // *Phys.Rev. E* (1998) **57**, 1668–1672.
- [38] A.N.Gorban, I.V.Karlin, V.B.Zmievskii, S.V.Dymova, Reduced description in reaction kinetics. // *Physica A* (2000) **275**(3–4), 361–379.
- [39] A.N.Gorban, I.V.Karlin, Uniqueness of thermodynamic projector and kinetic basis of molecular individualism. // *Physica A* (2004) **336**(3–4), 391–432.
- [40] A.N.Gorban, I.V.Karlin, Family of additive entropy functions out of thermodynamic limit. // *Phys.Rev. E* (2003) **67**, 016104.
- [41] T.D.Schneider, Evolution of biological information. // *Nucleic Acids Res.* (2000) **28**, 2794–2799.
- [42] W.S.Hyes, M.Borodovsky, How to interpret anonymous bacterial genome: Machine Learning Approach to Gene Identification. // *Genome Res.* (20??) ??, 2794–2799.
- [43] D.R.Bickel, B.J.West, Multiplicative and fractal processes in DNA evolution. *Fractals* (1998) **6**, 211–217.
- [44] N.N.Oiwa, J.A.Glazier, The fractal structure of the mitochondrial genomes. // *Physica A* (2002) **311**(3–4), 221–230.
- [45] M.A.Makarova, M.G.Sadovsky, Information approach in the problem of structure–function relation in biological macromolecules. // *Doklady Biochemistry and Biophysics* (2004) **6**, # 1, 236–240.